

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

file
COPY 1 OF 2 COPIES

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

28th Meeting

Thursday, 22 April 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS ☐
☐ DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S *10* 2011
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE *1 JUL 81* REVIEWER

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

28th Meeting

Thursday, 22 April 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General, Chairman

Matthew Baird
Director of Training, Member

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
DC/PP, Member

Lawrence R. Houston
ADD/A, Alt. for DD/A, Member

25X1A9A
25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
DAD/O, Member

[REDACTED]
AD/Communications, Member

George E. Meloon
DAD/P

Harrison G. Reynolds
AD/Personnel, Member

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
C/DDP/ADMIN, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
SA/DD/I, Alt. for DD/I, Member

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
Executive Secretary

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
Secretariat

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]
Reporter

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
CONFIDENTIAL

. . . The 28th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., Thursday, 22 April 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any corrections or changes desired in the minutes of the last meeting? If not, they will be considered approved as submitted.

Item 2, the continuation of the discussion on the promotion policy. You had distributed to you today, I believe, a memorandum from the Assistant Director for Personnel containing the Regulation on promotion, which I believe represents the general view of the group that met on Tuesday afternoon. I should say, for the benefit of the four of you who weren't here Tuesday afternoon when we discussed this Regulation on promotion, that

Mr. [] recommended that paragraphs 3 and 4--

MR. []: 4.a. and b.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The change to make it clearer than it was originally, and less complicated. I gather that we have, appended to this paper, suggestions from Mr. [] as to versions of 4.a. and b. that he would prefer.

What we did on Tuesday, for the benefit of Messrs. [] Houston, Baird and [] was to go through this Regulation paragraph by paragraph, leaving the controversial paragraphs until last. The controversial paragraphs ended up being the ones which in effect would put in a system of competitive promotion. We generally agreed that rather than put this competitive promotion in a Regulation the AD/Personnel for a period of 6 months would do what is proposed in the original draft, without actually laying it down in a Regulation, to see how it would work on a 6-month basis, and if it worked it was then to be reconsidered for actual formalization in a Regulation. On the basis of that compromise we were able to come up with this Regulation.

Now, I gather we have some trials and tribulations on paragraphs 4.a. and b. Ted, would you care to present your side of the picture, seeing that you were the one who suggested the amendment?

MR. []: Yes. I feel that paragraphs 3 and 4.a., b.(1) and (2) as presented in the original draft, are both misleading and confusing to the extent that they will create an unsatisfactory situation if we publish them.

~~SECRET~~
CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

But I believe, as I stated Tuesday, that the end result desired can be stated much more clearly, simply and briefly, and I have presented for discussion the addenda attached to the promotion policy, on the basis that it is much clearer and something that all of us can understand and live with.

MR. BAIRD: Did you feel that 3 was just unnecessary?

25X1A9A

MR. [] No, but I think that as the term "operating officials" is used in this Regulation it is confusing. I don't think we even need to get into a further discussion of the kinds of supervisory officials that are involved here, other than the heads of career services, which has already been appropriately defined. I believe the substitute I have recommended here would accomplish much more clearly, the intent of the original idea.

25X1A9A

MR. [] What is your definition of head of career service?

25X1A9A

MR. [] The Assistant Director or Chief of the Senior Staff involved.

25X1A9A

MR. []: Is that spelled out? If that is spelled out, that is fine.

25X1A9A

MR. [] That is all spelled out.

25X1A9A

MR. [] I think a good deal of confusion arises from the fact that the operating official as defined in paragraph 3.a. here, in the DD/I side of the picture, and I think from the DD/A side of the picture, do in fact correspond with the heads of the career service, whereas in the DD/P area they do not and cannot, literally cannot, if we are to maintain a career service that is well developed. The effort here is to find words that will fit the DD/I and DD/A areas as they stand, and at the same time provide for a continuation of essentially what we have now in the DD/P side, as will be amended when we get through with our present exercise on integration.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Either draft is satisfactory to us, and if Ted's draft is preferable to DD/P, I am fully agreeable.

25X1A9A

MR. [] We feel we can't live with the other.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How does DD/A feel?

MR. HOUSTON: I don't know whether Colonel White had any strong feelings on this. Personally, I rather like the DD/P draft.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How about AD/Personnel?

SECRET

SECRET

MR. REYNOLDS: I strongly object to it for very definite reasons, which I will give you. Under Regulation the Assistant Director for Personnel is charged with responsibility for the development and administration of an Agency-wide personnel program. I believe I was brought here to strengthen and increase the usefulness of the Office of Personnel to the Agency as a whole, and I can't agree to any proposal that weakens or denies the authority of the Office of Personnel to carry out its mission. This paper appears to me to set up a separate system for the DD/P complex, and ignores the chartered responsibility and authority of the AD/P. 25X1

25X1A9A MR. Where does it do that?

MR. REYNOLDS: All we do is rubber stamp, as I see it. You don't send over a promotion you turn down so that we would have any record of it. You approve a promotion yourself and you send it over to us to rubber stamp, and that is all. That is all I can see.

25X1A9A MR. When we send you a very well-staffed documentation we keep your desk clear of a lot of recommendations which we, with our knowledge of the people and the situation don't think you ought to consider and it wouldn't be worth your while to consider.

MR. REYNOLDS: Don't you think we should have a record of the people in the Agency if we are going to be responsible for administration, etc., of personnel in the Agency?

25X1A9A MR. Have a record of them?

MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, I think so. You send approved promotions to the AD/Personnel but if such recommendations are disapproved you just send them back.

25X1A9A MR. That is what your basic paper says.

MR. REYNOLDS: It doesn't really say that, Ted.

25X1A9A MR. That is what we were discussing here Tuesday.

MR. REYNOLDS: We have the appointment authority, and I think we should review all formal actions, regardless of whether they are approved or disapproved.

25X1A9A MR. That is not what you said in your basic paper.

MR. REYNOLDS: We were willing to go along with the basic paper when we left the other day, to experiment with it.

25X1A9A MR. : In effect this says exactly what you said.

25X1A9A MR. : Actually, this gives you something that no Personnel

SECRET

SECRET

Director has had in the past, and I think really needs, and that is the assurance that these actions have been thoroughly staffed out by responsible officials in the operating areas, including, in our case, this complicated business of having a staff structure rather superimposed upon the area structure, and necessarily so, so that you just simply get recommendations that are much more thoroughly thought through and much better balanced and weighed against other recommendations in the area. You just have a much cleaner thing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: John, I don't think anybody is arguing against that point. As I understand the point raised, the AD for Personnel is asking the question as to why he should not receive the promotion requests that have been denied within your own career service system. What is the answer to that question?

25X1A9A MR. []: That is a brand new question as far as I am concerned.

25X1 MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, it isn't, Ted, because if you look at Regulation [] or whatever it is, on page 3 of the new copy--

25X1A9A MR. []: But I thought we were deviating from the old copy here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Or, if you want to look at the old copy--

25X1A9A MR. []: The underlined portion that Personnel asked for, "Promotion requests which are not favorably considered by the operating official need not be submitted to the AD for Personnel." Frankly, I don't care.

25X1A9A MR. []: I do, very much.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's underlined here - "...need not be submitted....", and the new version saying "being submitted".

25X1A9A MR. []: I didn't put anything in this paper that deviated from the previous paper. Harry has brought up a new point that we had not discussed before, which he is quite entitled to do, but don't let's say I have changed it on the basis of the context of the paper we were previously considering. If we have a new point, now is the time to discuss it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then let's presume it is a new point and let's discuss it.

25X1A9A MR. []: Kirk, not having been in on this, I certainly would feel if one of the Divisions recommended a promotion to my boy and

SECRET

SECRET

and he disapproved it, I don't think then it ought to go over his head to be reviewed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, is it going over his head?

MR. []: It's just for his official information.

MR. []: I have no objection to that.

MR. []: I have no objection if there is no action.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My feeling on that, looking at it from both sides of the house, I can't imagine an instance where the AD/Personnel would take action on a promotion request that had been denied within an operating component. On the other hand, it does seem to me, looking at it from the point of view of insuring that we have a system of checks and balances, that your employee relations would be bettered by the knowledge of that employee that that did get into his official personnel file of the Agency and isn't just held up in an operating component. I feel that is part of the system of checks and balances which we erect for sound personnel management across the Agency.

MR. []: Certainly there is no objection to that.

MR. []: How far down does that begin to apply? You have a corporal recommending a promotion on a private, and that comes all the way up the line and has to go clear on up to the AD/Personnel. There ought to be a limit on who made the recommendation to the career service or head of the office before it becomes a really valid recommendation.

MR. []: If I know our system correctly, all recommendations for promotion come to a career service board.

MR. []: But they start way down the line, where one fellow pats the other fellow on the back--

MR. []: But if a Branch Chief recommends a promotion to a Division Chief, then his case would have to come to us.

MR. []: The Division Chiefs are supreme as far as recommendations to the career service board are concerned, in our area, which is just fine, because as [] is saying, everybody is trying to promote the next lower guy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your Career Service Board doesn't consider every promotion recommendation sent in, do they?

MR. []: Yes, it is considered in connection with the review of the individual.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9A

MR. [] We consider every recommendation that comes from a Division Chief, but he can stop anything he wants to below his level and we are happy never to hear of it.

MR. MELOON: Well, how would it be then where any promotion action is turned down or reaches the stage of being formally considered by a Board, being forwarded to the Personnel Office? That would get added stopping.

25X1A9A

MR. [] A board or career service head.

25X1A9A

MR. [] That would cut it down.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Just adding a sentence to b.

25X1A9A

MR. [] In my Office that would run 30, 40 or 50 cases a month - if you want that paper work.

MR. MELOON: I don't necessarily say we want it, and maybe only one in a hundred we would come back at you on, but I think it does, to some extent at least, give the employee the feeling that someone outside of the career service board in their bailiwick is looking out for their interests somewhere along the line.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I gather there is no fundamental objection to their being forwarded to the Personnel Director?

MR. MELOON: It's just as much a matter of review as would be the actions that are favorably acted upon by the board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Even the Personnel Office draft doesn't say that.

25X1A9A

MR. []: I think for information only, and only those that have to be processed to the career service board.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Because only you have the authority to make a promotion.

25X1A9A

MR. [] We can't live, George, with a system which provides for and encourages Division Chiefs to go to the Office of Personnel over the heads of the career services within the DD/P.

MR. REYNOLDS: We are not asking you to. Your system is based on your own system, which is the career service board.

I don't understand in paragraph c. here, this distinction between the three DD's and the other three components of Training, Commo and Personnel.

25X1A9A

MR. []: Because the three DD's, Harry, do have senior

SECRET

SECRET

boards sitting over all the specialist boards they are going to have.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Yes, ours is all approved.

25X1A9A

MR. [] So we do have a superior career service board

that sits over the FI, PP and PM boards, while in Training and your Office, and the Office of Communications, that situation does not exist.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Can we retrogress a second back to paragraph 4b, and I am using as my basic reference the DD/P's suggested amendment. Would there be any objection if we added to paragraph 4b, the last sentence of b.(1) of the Personnel Office re-draft of those particular paragraphs, which I will read to you. (Reading) "When such concurrence is not given, however, the promotion action will be forwarded to the Assistant Director for Personnel for his information and retention in the official file of the individual."

25X1A9A

MR. [] That is perfectly acceptable.

25X1A9A

MR. [] That is okay.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then going to Harry's point, paragraph 4.c.

25X1A9A

MR. [] You are still leaving hanging how far down it goes.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Only those acted on by the career service boards.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is perfectly clear. It isn't unclear in my mind.

25X1A9A

MR. [] If it's made a part of b. it can't very well be misunderstood, because that pertains only to the heads of the career services.

25X1A9A

MR. [] It depends on what the AD/Personnel is going to do with it.

25X1A9A

MR. [] If it's for information and retention, all right, but if I have to come in and justify the minutes of the career service board this will make a lot of correspondence back and forth between the offices.

25X1A9A

MR. [] This reads, "for his information and retention in the official file."

25X1A9A

MR. [] That is acceptable to me.

MR. REYNOLDS: I would like to explain why that is necessary. In the few months that I have been here there have been a number of cases where, if we had had such a record in our file it would have helped us make a decision on separation, and you call upon us for separations constantly.

25X1A9A

MR. [] I think you ought to have that information.

MR. MELOON: My feeling is that it would be a total waste of time

SECRET

SECRET

in many cases, but in the cases where it is effective it would be worth the trouble. Now let's see, Harry, if we intend to carry out what is listed here under responsibilities of the AD for Personnel. I don't think we should mislead this group, if we are going to review those for the four elements listed here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is not yet under discussion. We are still dealing with paragraphs 3 a and b, and 4 a, b(1) and (2), c and d, as I understand it, because the DD/P's proposal suggests the elimination of paragraph 3a, 3b stands, and the elimination of 4a, b(1) and (2), and substitution of the DD/P proposal, but all the rest stands as submitted. So if we can let's confine our discussion as to whether there is any disagreement on eliminating this paragraph on operating officials, that is, 3a, letting 3d stand as it is, and substituting for your 4a and b the 4a, b, c, and d suggested by DD/P, then your c would become e, and your d becomes f. That is the way I read the proposal as it now stands.

MR. We haven't changed anything.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Did I move that too fast?

MR. MELOON: I lost it completely.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right, I'll go over it again. Take the draft prepared by the Office of Personnel. On page 2, paragraph 3a, operating officials, is eliminated; paragraph 3b then becomes 3a, simply defining heads of career services; paragraphs 4a and 4b(1) and (2), operating officials, are eliminated. Substitute therefor paragraph 4 submitted by the DD/P, entitled responsibilities, with b of that particular proposal amended by the addition of the two sentences of your paragraph b.(1) - in other words, "...when such concurrence is not given...." Then, going back to your draft again, paragraph 4c, heads of career services, becomes 4e, and paragraph 4d, the AD/Personnel, becomes 4f. That is the new Regulation, as I see it, that we are looking at. Now all that actually has been done in the draft that was prepared by your Office is the elimination of the paragraph on operating officials, 3a, elimination of the first sentence of 3b(1), once again on operating officials, and elimination of 3b(2) discussing "The fact that a promotion action is recommended constitutes a certification by the operating official...." - and that is covered in 4d of the DD/P's proposal.

MR. But there are no operating officials.

25X1A9A

SECRET

SECRET

MR. KIRKPATRICK: "Supervisor" would be much better and make a stronger recommendation out of it.

MR. REYNOLDS: We have used "initiating activity". That is used in paragraph c.

25X1A9A MR. [] I think "supervisor" is the best word to use there, though.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I do, too.

25X1A9A MR. REYNOLDS: In place of "operating officials."

MR. [] Who is the supervisor?

25X1A9A MR. [] The guy who initiates the recommendation for promotion.

25X1A9A MR. [] He can't certify that. All he can say is, "He is the best qualified in my area division."

25X1A9A MR. [] Supervisor and each official through whom the recommendation passes.

25X1A9A MR. [] Certification by the head of the career service involved.

MR. HOUSTON: Say supervisor and subsequent approving authorities.

25X1A9A MR. [] For us I'd like to have "supervisor" because the division chiefs approve promotions up to 12, and they are certainly not the heads of career services but they are supervisors.

25X1A9A MR. []: And insofar as the supervisor is concerned this can apply to those people within his consideration as well as the head of the career service. It applies to both, actually. Remove the "or" there and say "certification by the supervisor and the head of the career service involved" - because this really pertains to those that go on forward.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, the and/or is appropriate if you are going to send on the ones that are turned down, because then your supervisor is hung on the fact that he recommended the promotion and said his man is best qualified in his zone of consideration.

25X1A9A MR. [] And it continues to broaden as the thing goes up.

25X1A9A MR. [] Certification is required only by the one who submits it to the AD/Personnel, which is the last one.

25X1A9A MR. [] If we change this wording it is required also by the initiating official.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. HOUSTON: That phrase "and/or" is a monstrosity. It isn't required here because it says recommending action will be a certification, so if they don't recommend they aren't certified.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Take the "and" out.

25X1A9A

MR. [] I think it has to go in there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's not hang on a conjunction. Is there any strong feeling as to whether it should be and/or or just and?

25X1A9A

MR. [] The "and" doesn't fit the DD/I situation but it does ours.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Take it all out. Recommendation constitutes certification.

25X1A9A

MR. [] This paragraph, by the way, I did not write.

25X1A9A

MR. [] If they go forward to the AD/P whether approved or disapproved, don't you want to change that, and return them to the initiating activity in b? You don't, do you? You send them on to Harry anyway.

25X1A9A

MR. [] We will send them a copy for information. We will still return it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then actually the sentence we are adding to your "b" would have to be modified to say, "When such concurrence is not given, however, a copy of the promotion action will be--

25X1A9A

MR. [] Is "concurrence" the word? Or do we have to change "concurrence"?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: When such "approval"?

MR. HOUSTON: Upon disapproval.

25X1A9A

MR. [] What are we going to do about and/or?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are those changes as suggested, acceptable to everybody? Harry, do you feel that violent damage has been done?

MR. REYNOLDS: My feeling is that I am the only voting member who has any zone of disagreement, but as it was expressed the other day, we will try to live with this. I am not entirely sold on it and there are things about it that I just don't like. But that is all right, if it doesn't work I am going to appeal it, that's all. But I hope it's going to work.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I see in this paper we now have--that we are agreeing on--we have eliminated a set of definitions about operating officials. I am inclined to agree with [] that that would create

25X1A9A

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

confusion, because our operating officials change so constantly, and with-
in the rather complex--with due apologies to the organization referred to--
structure of the DD/P, this is a little complicated. Your thought as
evidenced in your b(1) seems to me to be perfectly well upheld in the 4b
submitted by the DD/P area. Your second aspect of b is covered by being
included, and your b(2) is almost paraphrased in the draft submitted by
the DD/P, so as I see it the changes are not too horrendous.

25X1A9A

MR. [] 4d was written by the Personnel Office, not by me.

MR. BAIRD: Do I understand, Kirk, that this is going to be
tried as agreed to now, with the modifications, for six months?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not necessarily. Mr. Reynolds has just made
the statement that if this Regulation does not work he plans to appeal it.
Well, it is my feeling that when a Regulation does not work, any respon-
sible official should appeal, but promptly. What is going to be tried for
six months, Matt, are the two very controversial paragraphs that were put
into the original draft, which stated that when a promotion recommendation
is made the Personnel Office would review all other employees in the Agency
in that or the next higher grade to see whether any of them were equally
or better qualified. We agreed Tuesday that that was certainly a definite
goal that we would work toward, but that we didn't think it could be
properly accomplished at the present time. But we asked that the Personnel
Office start doing that, without putting it in a Regulation, to see if we
couldn't get to a competitive promotion system.

MR. BAIRD: I have heard some discussion today which I am sur-
prised that Harry doesn't take exception to, but if he is happy about it--

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, I do take exception to it but I am complete-
ly out-voted on it, Matt, and I am not going to be the one who blocks this
whole thing when it has been batted around here for two years now.

MR. BAIRD: Well, John, you obviously must have very good reasons
why you say that any promotion which is turned down by your Division Chief
gets no further, but I would just like to say that not having much first-
hand knowledge of the DD/P Office, I think that is one of the reasons that
you have good morale in some divisions and lousy morale in others; and that,
like certain officers in the Army that never promoted or gave an efficiency
record that was good to a first lieutenant, some first lieutenants never
got anything more than "very satisfactory". It just seems to me there

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

ought to be some review.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I heard this morning of an economist who says Gresham's Law works perfectly in personnel, that bad money drives the good out and bad personnel will drive the good out; therefore, sooner or later Democratic processes take their place and a division chief is replaced and you set up a new division system.

MR. BAIRD: That takes a long time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is quite correct. But I don't think the CIA Career Service Board should tell the DD/P how to run his divisions anymore than we would tell you how to run the Office of Training.

25X1A9A

MR. [] You might make a case there in reverse, because in my estimation the divisions that have the worst morale are the ones that have been the most lavish with their promotions.

MR. BAIRD: But there should be a review to keep consistent within the Agency.

25X1A9A

MR. [] There will be review in this zone of consideration business. This requires that there be an annual review of everybody by the career service board.

MR. BAIRD: But you have said if the division chief turns it down, even if he's in the zone of promotion, that it doesn't get any further.

25X1A9A

MR. [] It has to get further in the annual review.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The annual review has to get to the career service board.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Career service boards have to conduct an annual review of everyone coming into the zone. And I think that is good.

MR. BAIRD: I see. That does take care of it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This says the head of each career service is required--

MR. BAIRD: And that gets beyond the division chief?

25X1A9A

MR. [] Oh, absolutely, otherwise it's no good.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Before we put the final stamp on this I'd like to give Harry another chance to state where it is weak as far as he is concerned.

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, I feel that if we have the power of appointment--which is very definite--that we should have the power to

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

review, and when we clearly see there is an inequity we should be able to bring that to the attention of the people concerned. As this is now written if there is something that we don't like we can't do a damn thing about it. But I am willing to try it to see if it works. I don't propose to tell the DD/P or any other office in this Agency how it shall run its business, but I am trying to run ours for the benefit of the whole Agency. I am pledged to do that. But, as I say, I am not going to sit here and block something which has been hassled over for two years. We will simply try it, and that is all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, you will go through a period of trying moral suasion to see if that accomplishes the review required, and if that fails then you will appeal for a mandatory review.

MR. REYNOLDS: We have to come to an overall promotion policy throughout the Agency. We are willing to put that on a trial basis for six months, as was agreed at our previous meeting, and we are going to try very sincerely to sell it to the Agency as a whole that it can be done and that it is a proper way to conduct our business. I know Ted feels that it is going to take a long time, but we think it will take less time, and I hope to prove that it will.

25X1A9A MR. []: I hope it will take less and I hope you can prove it to us - because I want the same end result as you do, Harry.

MR. REYNOLDS: So, as far as this goes, Kirk, let's take a crack at it and see what we can do with it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any strong disagreement on that philosophy? Is there any strong feeling that the power of review should be incorporated in this Regulation?

MR. MELOON: Has "f" been eliminated?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, indeed, "f" stands. You mean 4f now?

MR. MELOON: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That stands in the Regulation.

MR. MELOON: I think they all ought to read that, because when questions came up as to sending these turn-downs to the Office of Personnel for information only, the question was asked, "Well, what are they going to do with them?" "If they do anything with them we would object to it." They ought to read those four points there, because I think if they are reviewed against those four there is a possibility that something will be

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

done other than just filing them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, George, the view was expressed that if each individual turn-down was subject to review, and then bounced back to the initiating office for a full review, that the system would become so complicated and time-consuming that it would fail of its own merit. But I don't think anybody objects to any one of these four points as the principles for sound personnel relations. They didn't Tuesday and I don't see them objecting today. My only other suggestion is - you've got it, so why argue about it?

MR. MELOON: I want to make sure it's clear.

MR. []: You mean your sub-paragraph 3 there conflicts?

MR. []: We can live with that.

MR. MELOON: Joe is under the impression, as I gather, that the only thing we are going to do with them is file them. If Harry carries out the responsibilities contained in those four, he may do something other than file those turn-downs.

MR. []: We have lifted your own language out of this and incorporated it.

MR. HOUSTON: You can use it for statistics and setting general standards, but I don't think it implies you take action on one case, the way it was written in your own draft.

MR. []: We have lifted your own language.

MR. MELOON: This outlines the responsibilities of the AD/Personnel, and if he is insuring compliance with the Regulation by continuous evaluation of the promotion program, then I think he is reviewing those turn-downs just as well as he is reviewing the approvals.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We don't have a Regulation on this particular phase right now, but I still think that today the AD/Personnel still has the right, if an employee appeals to him against a turned-down promotion, he has the right to review.

MR. MELOON: If the employee appeals. Are we going to make it necessary for the employee to appeal?

MR. []: But if you start promoting people in the divisions against the expressed better judgment of the division chief, you've had it.

MR. []: Or the head of the career service.

MR. []: From a practical standpoint that will never happen.

It seems to me, George, you might get a case where an office turns a man

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

down for not being qualified but you might turn around and place him elsewhere.

MR. BAIRD: That is the point. That is what I have been fighting for in this thing. If you have a file on an employee who, say, has been in FE or FI for four or five years and has been consistently turned down for promotion, it seems to me Harry has the right to go back to FE or FI and say, "Obviously this man isn't doing the job he should be doing for you. Now maybe I can place him somewhere else where it will be more beneficial to the Agency AND to the individual."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is fine, but I don't think that is the sort of thing you want to spell out in a Regulation. Every mal-content getting turned down because he is not qualified to get promoted is going to be running around appealing it. This covers it without getting into that detail.

MR. BAIRD: Then if they can do that, that is fine.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, can we agree on and close the discussion of the promotion policy, and if the DD/A will see to it that the Regulations Staff gets a copy of this--

25X1A9A MR. [] I think the Personnel Office should put this in form for the DD/A and request that it be published without further coordination.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection to that?

MR. BAIRD: There is no chance to make a last minute plug for the extension of the time-in-grade is there?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How do you want to extend the time-in-grade, remembering this is entering the zone of consideration only.

MR. BAIRD: You know what that means, when they enter it they think they should be promoted.

25X1A9A MR. [] We went over this very thoroughly Tuesday. We agreed there is enough flexibility in it and that the language does not make time-in-grade a mandatory qualification for promotion. We have to have some flexibility on that time-in-grade thing or we are going to have a Hydra-headed monster that we can't live with.

MR. BAIRD: I think your flexibility is easier in the case of an employee who really "has the stuff" that you want to promote, than it is with the great numbers that are going to come into the promotion zone

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

and are not going to get promoted.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The Office of Communications has already had this in effect now for some period, and it is my observation that their system is working exceedingly well. Their employees now understand they may enter the zone of consideration and they may remain in that zone for several years before they get promoted, and they may NEVER get promoted.

25X1A9A MR. [] But they are always considered.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the major part of this. At our meeting in June if we can get that across to the supervisors and through them to the average employee, we will strike a great blow for freedom.

MR. BAIRD: You say you have given this careful consideration? Okay.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further discussion? Then this will be referred by the Office of Personnel to the DD/A for publication without further coordination.

Item 3, the Staff Study on the Career Development of Junior Personnel, submitted by the Task Force. Has everybody had a chance to study it? Is there any specific comment on it?

25X1A9A MR. [] One thing. It seems to me if you give people a right to apply you are going to be in difficulty, because I think they should be selected rather than to allow people to apply. If you advertise, "Here is a select group" - then you are going to move into a different problem and you will get a lot of applications from people who just want to get out of their present area because they are looking for greener fields. I believe it is up to the supervisor to look for a man he believes is a "comer", and for him to say, "Look, I want to give you training that is going to broaden you" - and work out a plan.

25X1A9A MR. [] That is the way we feel. We feel this thing can be done quietly and unobtrusively on a very careful, selective basis, without this kind of publicity. We think you would get the "elite corps" idea again. I don't think we need a separate T/O for it.

25X1A9A MR. [] And you, Harry, can keep a very confidential list of people selected and keep an eye on them to be sure they're taken care of.

25X1A9A MR. [] Frankly, I don't think we need this Regulation.

25X1A9A MR. [] I think we can do it just by doing it.

25X1A9A MR. [] It has vicious, inherent dangers in it.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually we don't need it as a Regulation but shouldn't we have the procedures fairly well spelled out internally?

25X1A9A MR. [] That might be a good idea, to go, say, to the head of each career service and the principal officers of the Agency.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But if you say nobody can apply for it aren't you then almost guaranteeing the creation of an "elite corps" chosen by the oligarchy?

25X1A9A MR. [] Now, what oligarchy, Kirk? Because here again you have an across-the-board Agency problem again, with everybody having a finger in it.

MR. HOUSTON: Kirk, these applications will come up on the same informal basis, too, and fellows can very well let it be known to their supervisors--

25X1A9A MR. []: It seems to me if we publish policy that we go around selecting people who are going to be the "big guys" in the Agency, the reaction would be very bad. If you think you have a lot of people coming to your door now, the flock that you are going to get on a "Why am I not selected on this thing" - is going to be something.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But I could argue on the other side of that one to the effect that the sooner we get the sheep from the goats, the faster the progress will be.

25X1A9A MR. [] Are these truly the big sheep and everybody else the goats?

25X1A9A MR. [] It means a lot of goats.

25X1A9A MR. [] There are always going to be a lot of goats.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Of course, we assume our goats are equal to Generals in other armies, to mix a metaphor.

25X1A9A MR. [] This rotation program is not necessarily designed in all cases to create the assistant directors of CIA. It might create some GS-13's in Harry Reynold's office--

MR. REYNOLDS: I look upon them as not going above a GS-13 anyway. Those are the most important people in the Agency.

25X1A9A MR. [] But if they are set up as a special corps it's going to become, in their eyes, an elite corps.

25X1A9A MR. [] I have engaged in a good deal of this already. We are doing it constantly.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

25X1A9A

MR. [] As I remember the discussion of this problem, we originally decided one of our needs was to be able to rotate people to get across-the-board training and that we weren't getting anywhere by taking the over-all problem. So it was agreed we ought to work with a smaller number and the magic figure of 120 was used. All of this is a mechanism to orderly rotate people. It is not intended that it be limiting. The numbers we start with are small, but it has to crawl before it starts to walk and run. This would, in a sense, clarify the slot problem.

25X1A9A

MR. []: That is one of the things that scares me about this thing, the slot problem. The end result in placement problems that are created by setting up these separate groups and permitting the jobs to be filled behind them, and giving these people assurance that when they are through they are going to be placed, is a very considerable problem. Unhappily I happen to have more than my share of them, and it's rough.

MR. BAIRD: Have you got really good people in that position, that you can't slot them?

25X1A9A

MR. []: No, unhappily the ones that have come back to me nobody has wanted. That creates the problem.

MR. BAIRD: What ones are they, Ted?

25X1A9A

MR. [] They have come back to you, to your JOT.

MR. BAIRD: I think if you don't do this--

25X1A9A

MR. [] I'm all for the JOT program

MR. BAIRD (Continuing): --I'm afraid what is going to happen is that the JOT's are going to be the ones that will take advantage of this and not the people that have been in the Agency.

25X1A9A

MR. [] They can't very well take advantage if we work this on a very strict, selective basis - the JOT people and everybody else. Your JOT's are going to apply en masse, because they started out that way.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's see what we can reach general agreement on. Is it generally agreed that it would be wiser not to advertise such a program and have the selection done on a careful, selective basis by a competent board of senior people?

25X1A9A

MR. [] I think your recommendations to the board should be made by the heads of the career service rather than on an application basis.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9A

MR. [] The only concern I have there is that you can definitely get into an elite corps with a secretive set-up. I was hoping we could go to Agriculture with something for these people. They are all saying, "What is this career development? Where do I transfer for training?" It was hoped this would be a simple mechanism to encourage that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, Gene, I think the day has come when we can see fairly clearly that rotation is for the limited few, and we have tried to get that across to them in the past.

MR. BAIRD: Let's not call it "rotation".

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, "career development" then. I think, too, that if we allowed it to be done on an application or en masse basis the whole system would be swamped fairly early, either swamped or become ineffective. And I think it's going to sharpen the supervisors up considerably to put the burden on them for the selection of individuals, and through them the respective career service boards.

25X1A9A

MR. [] That means we have to work at it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That's the whole point - we haven't worked at this before, and I think we can work at it ad nauseam - until we get a central mechanism for accomplishing it. We must get a central mechanism in the Agency.

MR. BAIRD: Then let's try this for six months without the application, and see how many supervisors are coming up with the really right kind of people. It's just human nature for a supervisor who has somebody under him who knows quite a lot - he's not going to recommend him to get out from under him.

25X1A9A

MR. []: Should it not be given out by the Career Council? Maybe that would be the appropriate way to do that.

MR. REYNOLDS: That would be the successor to this Board that would implement that. I believe there's a factor in this which hasn't been mentioned, that you had intended, Kirk, to use this as the chief instrument for your Junior Executive Inventory, which I presume would not be considered an elite corps anymore than the Senior Executive Inventory.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we are jousting with semantics when we refer to and back away from an "elite corps", because whether you call it an "elite corps" or not, the natural progress of succession in the

SECRET

SECRET

Agency is that way. Maybe you don't want to say you have a "Schutzstaffel" in CIA, and maybe it isn't composed that way, but the natural process of succession results in the same way, that the best people get to the top. All we are trying to accomplish here is a method of selecting people to broaden them and make them better qualified to reach the top.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Maybe it's about time that we write "career service" with a small "c" and a small "s". We can overbuild to the point where the end result will be bad rather than good.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it has been over-built. One of the purposes I have in mind is to de-glamorize the career service program as such, and re-emphasize the importance of the supervisors in normal personnel actions in the whole field. To my mind the one greatest failure--which we can blame ourselves for, and nobody else--is the fact that we have burned up a considerable amount of executive time on career service and yet there is very little appreciation of what has been accomplished, which actually represents quite a major achievement. If we could just get across to our people--despite repeated studies, and by State on Foreign Service--that we can still stand first in the Federal Government for having given more attention to the problem of personnel relations on a high, executive level in the last three years, than any other Agency in the Federal Government.

25X1A9A

MR. [] I think that ought to be made awfully clear to the body politic in this Agency, because there is a lot of bitching going on. Actually, the young people in this Agency have a better shake than young people anywhere that I know of.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think I'll hammer this across in the next orientation course, the fact that we have a higher level of personnel than any other agency in the Government, as far as grades are concerned.

So that we do accomplish something this afternoon on this particular paper, I would recommend, in view of the fact we have had only a few minutes to discuss it this afternoon, that we defer further deliberations until our next meeting, with the objective in mind of establishing in this paper a framework for the administration of a career development slot, to be used as general guidance but not generally disseminated to the Agency at large.

MR. BAIRD: Can't we wipe it out today? All you have to say is that this is a good framework to do it in and that it won't be published.

SECRET

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

25X1A9A

[] Except for the slot business. I think they ought to be slotted where they are working.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that particular point being quite a touchy one, because everybody's slots are involved--

25X1A9A

MR. [] Any time someone leaves a slot we hold a slot for him.

MR. BAIRD: But you may not get him back; therefore you shouldn't hold it for him.

25X1A9A

MR. []: These people are going to be of considerable value to the offices they're working in. Why should they have them as added numbers?

25X1A9A

MR. []: I don't think we are always going to be quite as tight on the slot business as we are now. We're going to find slots loosening up before long.

MR. MELOON: I would like to know the foundation for that conclusion.

25X1A9A

MR. [] The slotting problem is the biggest deterrent in our area to the rotation of people, and when I learned there were 50 to 90 slots available for this purpose, I was most happy.

25X1A9A

MR. []: That's just it. You will have placement problems. Two of them are too many right now.

MR. BAIRD: If they are too many how can you handle it?

25X1A9A

MR. [] We can handle it, but from here on out we are not going to have those problems, because we don't permit people to go on detached service without having the slot for them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, we seem to have a slight disagreement on the slotting problem. As far as this paper is concerned, we will put this paper over to the next meeting, and if those who have strong views on slots will come in with their solutions, we can reach an agreement next week.

25X1A9A

MR. [] You are going to have a very controversial matter next week.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is the agenda for next week?

25X1A9A

MR. [] The establishment of THE Career Service on a 3-year basis.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I trust the paper will be out early in advance because if we run into a sticky one on that we may have to meet on Monday,

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

Tuesday and Wednesday of the following week to get it through.

Any other new business?

MR. BAIRD: Wasn't that all approved at one time?

25X1A9A

MR. [] It was. It's not implemented, though.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The point is, like this promotion paper now, let's see if we can't get these three things through and have the christening ceremony shortly thereafter.

25X1A9A

Any new business, Mr. []

25X1A9A

MR. []: No, Sir.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: When are we going to discuss that highly controversial Personnel Evaluation Form?

25X1A9A

MR. [] That is attached to this paper for next week.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then I would like to take this opportunity to extend an invitation to Messrs. [] and Meloon for a return appearance. They both have strong views.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

MR. []: Kirk, I think it's going to be necessary, and I would so recommend, that a task force be set up on harmonizing the Personnel Evaluation Report and the Career Selection Report, because I don't see how it's going to be done otherwise.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, who should be the harmonizers?

25X1A9A

MR. []: A task force isn't going to do that, [] That has to be bounced around this table.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you want to bring Dr. [] with you so you can use another protagonist on this particular subject--

MR. BAIRD: Well, he was asked to revise the form and it was all approved, but I could bring him back and just have him repeat what he said before.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: He might want to be here with technical advice. I still say what I said last week, if a supervisor hasn't got enough sense to fill out that new form he shouldn't be a supervisor.

25X1A9A

MR. []: Almost anything would be better than what we've got.

MR. BAIRD: What is the controversial element on evaluations?

25X1A9A

MR. []: The controversy, as I see it, revolves around this problem: Under what circumstances do you use the new Selection Report, which is designed for one purpose and that is to enable the Selection

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~SECRET~~

Board to make its selection at the end of a 3-year period.

25X1A9A

MR. [] Does it have a comparative possibility in it?

25X1A9A

MR. [] The second point is that the Personnel Evaluation Report, which we still haven't gotten into the field yet and which therefore hasn't been used for half the Agency - already there are, I would say, more than rumbles of dissatisfaction with them. And the third point, is it possible to devise one evaluation system that will serve all these purposes, namely, the generation of a career development plan, which is part of the PER, the evaluation on a comparative basis across-the-board and on a competitive basis, which is what we are talking about--whether we said it or not--serving as a supervisory tool between the supervisor and the employee, which was the principal purpose and goal of the PER. And if you can't have all of these things in one form then do you use one, two or three forms for an individual at the same time? Those are the problems. Do you use both the PER and the CSR? Do you use one this year or for the first three years, and the PER thereafter? And do you continue to use the Career Selection Report after the man has been selected? That seems a little bit silly, because it was designed to select him, and therefore it was designed to be used for the first three years only. Those are the problems. I don't know whether they could be solved by this group without a technical group doing some preparation for it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think a technical group is going to accomplish a darn thing except spin their wheels some more. Let's have the technicians here to offer advice and comfort over the shoulders of the Board. But this is one thing we kicked around worse than the Washington infield against the Yankees, and if we don't get it out the horse-laugh from [] is going to be deafening.

25X1A6A

MR. BAIRD: That is the thing that is discouraging, we spend so much time and finally approve something, and then two months later find that it has all been disapproved.

25X1A9A

MR. [] We approved the PER two years ago but it still is not in the field.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other new business? Now that we have had this preview of next week, the meeting stands adjourned.

. . . The Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m. . . .

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~